

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/642,935	Applicant(s) IKEZAKI, YOSHIKAZU	
	Examiner Tiffany A Fetzner	Art Unit 2859	

All Participants:

(1) Tiffany A Fetzner.

(2) Assoc. Nish Patel Cert. of limited Recognition.

Date of Interview: 17 August 2004

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 10:15 Am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
independent claim 1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 12, and 14-17.

Prior art documents discussed:
See Continuation Sheet


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: None, The examiner addressed applicant's preliminary amendment statement in the disclosure that "Parallel imaging according to the MS-DW-EPI technique has not been conducted. This is because when imaging echoes are phase-corrected by the navigator echo, the phase originating from the sensitivity of the receiver systems is unnecessarily corrected, resulting in inconsistency with the sensitivity matrix." [See the preliminary amendment of 08/18/2003] Additionally, the examiner pointed out that applicant's claims as originally filed had numerous formal matters in need of correction, (i.e. intended use in the apparatus claims, antecedent basis, in the dependent claims, and improper identification of components in figures 8, 9, and 10, and clarifying that the components recited in independent claim 1, have support from figure 10 such that the structure set forth in the claim 1 corresponds to the teachings of applicant's originally filed abstract and specification. .

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative on August 17th 2004, because there were numerous formal matters which were outstanding in the claims, drawings and specification which is amended by the examiner, would place the instant application in condition for allowance, because the prior art fails to teach or suggest applicant's inventive apparatus which enables parallel magnetic resonance imaging to be performed even when a navigator echo is used to phase-correct an imaging echo, because in applicant's magnetic resonance apparatus the navigator echo does not impact the sensitivity data, which is contrary to the established teachings of the prior art or record. The examiner and the attorney discussed formal corrections to address the intended use issues with the apparatus claims, the antecedent basis objection concerns of the examiner, a more descriptive title, and corrections to ensure the proper identification of recited components, so that the originally filed specification is consistent with applicant's figures and claims. The examiner agreed to make the proposed changes by examiner's amendment. All of the amendments made by the examiner were made to clarify, the applicant's claimed inventive structure, rectify the issue of intended use, correct the antecedent basis concerns, and ensure consistency throughout the applicant's original disclosure, specification and claims. No new matter was added. The examiner was given permission to make the examiner's amendment and charge any fees if necessary. The examiner was also thanked for her time. .